DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 470 SO 012 183

AUTHOR Jones, Ruth S.
TITLE Democratic Values and Pre-Adult Virtues: Tolerance, Knowledge and Participation.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, D.C., August 30-September 3, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Age Groups; Behavioral Science Research; Beliefs; Changing Attitudes; *Citizen Participation; Citizenship; *Democratic Values; Elementary Secondary Education; *Knowledge Level; *Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Politics; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; Surveys; *Youth
IDENTIFIERS National Assessment of Educational Progress

ABSTRACT

Two political socialization issues were explored for 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old youth. The first issue was the extent to which there is a general orientation among American youth toward tolerance. The second issue was the relationship of tolerance among youth to political knowledge and orientation to political participation. A major objective of the study was to add information based on a national sample to the profile of political orientations of American youth. The inquiry was based on secondary analysis of 1976 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data. From 1,800 to 2,000 youth in each age group were asked questions about tolerance attitudes, including should women run for public office? should atheists be allowed to vote? and should citizens be allowed to criticize the government? Youth in the nine-year-old group were asked simple picture-related questions of a similar nature. Statistical analysis of responses for all age groups indicated that there is modestly strong lip service given to general principles of equity and tolerance of diversity but severely constrained application of these general rules to both specific groups and activities. Questions asked at each age level are included and tables are presented which detail responses to specific questions within each age group. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179470

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth S. Jones
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Democratic Values and Pre-Adult Virtues: Tolerance, Knowledge and Participation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ruth S. Jones
Department of Political Science
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C. August 30-September 3, 1979.

SP 012 163

Democratic Values and Pre-Adult Virtues
Tolerance, Knowledge and Participation

Although no consensus exists about what constitutes "democratic citizenship", the general themes of citizen education in this country suggest that the ideal citizen will, at a minimum, (1) respect and be tolerant of other people and diverse ideas, (2) be politically informed and (3) act politically on the basis of this knowledge. Most political socialization research is directly or indirectly related to one of these three aspects of politicization and most formal approaches to citizen education have as their goal this triad of democratic values.

During the past twenty years scholars have been reasonably successful in providing descriptive information on the extent to which these democratic values and behaviors are mirrored in the American citizenry (Campbell, et al., 1964; Pomper, 1975) and students of political socialization have extended the analysis from American voters to American youth. With the exception of Jenning's student-parent study (Jennings, 1971) however, nothing in socialization research has even remotely approximated the commitment of resources and the scope of research efforts that have been directed toward adult electoral behavior and public opinion. Whereas the political profile of the contemporary adult has emerged from many technically sophisticated studies of random national samples of the voting age population (e.g., CPS Election Studies, NORC General Social Surveys, and Gallup Opinion Polls), the political profile of future citizens is derived primarily from a series of limited, independent case studies.

This paper is the last in a series that seeks to explore some of the traditional socialization issues by using a national sample of three age cohorts of students.[1] Descriptions of the levels of information possessed by adolescents as well as their participatory orientations have been presented elsewhere (Jones 1979[a], Jones 1979[b]). This paper will focus on the third aspect of the ideal-

citizen model which deals with respect for individuals rights, equality, freedom, i.e., a general tolerance for diversity. In so doing, it will add information based on a national sample to the profile of the political orientations of American youth but its primary objective is to seek answers to two specific questions. First, to what extent is there some general orientation toward tolerance among American youth as opposed to isolated, random, and issue specific responses? Second, what is the relationship of tolerance to the other parts of the citizenship triangle--political knowledge and participatory orientations?

Although fundamental to the American vision of democratic politics, the principles and procedures involved in creating and maintaining tolerance have not been as central to socialization research as have been concerns about political cognitions, respect for authority or predispositions to trust or to act. This is both understandable and curious--understandable because the record of adult Americans is not terribly impressive on this dimension so there is little reason to expect a democratic "ideology" among adolescents (Prothro and Grigg, 1960; Stouffer, 1963; McClosky, 1964); and curious because an understanding of early socialization on this dimension might help explain and ultimately lead to a change in adult patterns.

Some efforts have been made to study the presence of democratic values, especially acceptance of first amendment freedoms, and it is from these case studies of the mid 1960's that the impetus for this inquiry arose. (Zellman and Sears, 1971; Hess, 1968; Langton and Jennings, 1968; Jennings and Niemi, 1968; Remmers and Franklin, 1963; Merelman, 1971). These studies led to the conclusions that American adolescents:

--are even less consistent than adults in applying abstract principles to concrete situations and vary in concrete application according to the specific group or act being considered

--are strongly influenced in applying democratic principles to specific situations by their attitudes toward unpopular groups per se

--are more tolerant of religious differences than political differences

--possess general acceptance of political equality when it comes to matters of exercising the franchise but differentiate on the significance to be attached to votes by different segments of the population

--become more tolerant with age but the progression is slow, modest, and asymmetrical.

We do not expect, therefore to find a fully constrained belief system in young adults rather we will look for the "seeds" of some kind of organizing mechanism. We are interested also in determining if the profile of youth's tolerance, based on data from the late 1960's case studies, will be maintained when we examine similar attitudes in a national sample in 1976. If the Vietnam and Watergate era was as tumultuous as many have assumed, the expectation of change is not unwarranted. An increase in (acceptance) (rejection) of diversity and individual rights or a (expanding) (narrowing) of legitimate political behavior would alter the democratic fiber of our society.

Our interest in the relationship of tolerance to political knowledge and participation is of a more applied nature. The extent and strength of integration of these three components of democratic citizenship are important for assessing the assumptions that underlie the models guiding formal citizen education in this country. If the relationships are strong but the absolute distribution of tolerance attitudes is weak, one might argue that the approach is valid but simply not powerful enough. If attitudes of tolerance exist but have no relationship to political knowledge or participation, then an approach that tries to address all three coterminously may not be the best way to realize the ultimate goals of citizen education.

Study organization. The inquiry is based on secondary analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data. NAEP uses a highly sophisticated three-stage national stratified probability sample of students from which response

estimates can be made for the nation as a whole for a given age group and for sub-groups of interest. Students surveyed are nine, thirteen and seventeen years old; there are 1800 to 2000 respondents for each age group for each protocol.

As in most secondary analysis efforts, there are limitations on adapting NAEP data for socialization research purposes. NAEP uses an elaborate measurement-design process in an attempt to develop questions for each age group that will measure basic orientations toward democratic citizenship (NAEP, 1969). The fact that measures are generally specific to each age group therefore limits direct comparisons between age cohorts. Similarly, the unique sampling procedures used by NAEP mean that each of the multiple protocols administered in each assessment to each age group usually contain only a few measures specifically designed to tap the same dimension. For our study we have selected one particular set of protocols from the 1976 assessment which contained several items related to openness, equity and tolerance. Even here, however, the scope is far from inclusive.

The paper will begin with a brief comparison of the only measures common to all three age groups and then move to the general consideration of tolerance attitudes within each cohort. Next, the paper will focus on the relationship of tolerance to knowledge and participation, will look at some of the possible causes of differences in tolerance among American youth, and, as a concluding note, will provide a perspective for these findings with a comparison to tolerance attitudes among youth in other nations, within the adult U.S. population, and over time.

Distribution of Attitudes. The general lip service to abstract democratic values--free speech, religion, etc.--has been documented in numerous other studies (Prothro and Grigg, 1960; Zellman and Sears, 1971; Lawrence, 1976). We are here concerned with the application of these basic norms as they involve specific groups or particular political procedures. The measures common to all three age groups involved the exercise of the franchise by specific types of people. Each

measure included a picture to illustrate the specific situation and students were asked if that person should have the right to vote. The pictures and situations described were

--a 27 year old factory worker, male black, medium build, neat, open collar, sunglasses

--an athiest who teaches her children not to believe in God, female, white, middle aged, lined-face, short modest hair style, neat, open collar blouse

--a 25 year old unemployed male whose wife is employed, white, heavy, glasses, bearded, unkempt hair, open collar and suit jacket

The percentage of students granting the right to vote was as follows:

	9	13	17
Black, male factory worker	92.2	97.7	97.3
White, female athiest	41.0	68.1	86.8
White, male unemployed	74.3	79.4	84.8

These responses suggest that (1) students do not view the franchise as an unqualified right, (2) age or maturation remains very relevant even to the application of this fundamental democratic right, and (3) personal beliefs (religious) and status (economic) are seen by young people as legitimate reasons for withholding the vote.

Central to the following discussion are the responses to a series of measures included in both the thirteen and seventeen year old assessments which were coded on a five point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Women should run for public office and take part in the government much the same as men do.
No matter what a man's color, religion, or nationality, if he is qualified for a job he should get it.
It is wrong to criticize our government.
Swimming pools should admit people of all races and nationalities to swim together in the same pool.
Citizens must always be free to criticize the government.
Hotels are right in refusing to admit people of certain races or nationalities.
People who disagree with the government should be allowed to meet and hold public protests.
Women should have the same rights as men in every way.
People of certain races or religions should be kept out of important positions in our nation.
Women should stay out of politics.
Most women do not need the right to vote.

It is good for a government to be frequently criticized.
When something is wrong, it is better to complain to the government about it than to keep quiet.
War is sometimes the only way in which a nation can save its self-respect.
Talking things over with another nation is better than fighting.
Our nation has its faults like other nations.
People should not criticize the government, it only interrupts the government's work.

In addition, seventeen year olds were asked to respond to measures about allowing the Socialist Workers Party to nominate a candidate for President; the right of eleven different groups (e.g., ACLU, American Communist Party, Black Panthers, Gay Liberation Front, KKK) to hold public meetings in order to present political views; and the right of a soldier, off duty, engaging in a protest; a citizen protesting to a newspaper about blacks voting; and a speaker publicly urging a restriction on the number of children in a family; and the right of a citizen to appear on TV to campaign for a Nazi party candidate.

Nine year olds were asked the three picture-related questions plus: Should (rich people's) (educated people's) (men's) votes count more than (poor peoples') (people without much education) (women's votes)? Would you want to have a person of a different skin color sit next to you in school every day? be your teacher? be your friend? Do you think girls and boys should be allowed to play on the same baseball team? Should women get the same pay as men for doing the same work?

The response distribution shown on Table 1 suggests that student attitudes are not highly ordered by some pervasive sense of tolerance, equity or openness. Although maturation appears to play a role, there are sharp differences between the two older age groups only on matters related to criticism of the government. One suspects that the supportive, trusting allegiance of early adolescence (documented as system support in the early socialization studies) is the primary constraint here--e.g., a positive relationship to government rather than a negative orientation toward political criticism per se. Among thirteen and seventeen year olds, the highest pro-democratic attitudes are on issues that tap equality in jobs, swimming pools and hotels and orientations toward international compromise.

Table 1

Measure of Tolerance

Measures	% Pro-Democratic	
	17	13
Women should run for office	75.9	67.7
Qualified should get job	96.4	94.0
Wrong to criticize government	65.0	39.7
Swimming pools not segregated	80.1	76.9
Citizens must be free to criticize	75.7	51.2
Hotels practice open accomodations	88.4	82.1
Dissidents allowed to meet, protest	63.2	56.2
Women same rights in every way	59.6	54.2
Race, religion no barrier to high position	79.7	77.4
Keep women out of politics	77.7	67.0
Women need right to vote	89.2	83.3
Criticism of government is healthy	59.1	44.1
Complaining better than keeping quiet	86.3	79.8
War only way sometimes	57.5	53.5
Talking with nations better	94.7	94.9
Our nation has faults	98.0	93.7
Criticism interrupts gov'ts work	80.8	58.2
Soldier can protest	69.3	—
Advocate no votes for Blacks	46.7	—
Speak to regulate number of children	39.5	—
Campaign for Nazi Party	31.2	—
Socialist to nominate Presidential Candidate	48.6	—

NINE year olds

Rich votes count more	74.9
Educated votes count more	64.5
Men's votes count more	80.4
Sit by person of different color	55.3
Teacher of different color	53.0
Friend of different color	74.5
Women get same pay	86.4
Boys and girls on same team	73.6

The significance of applying a right in a specific situation or activity (i.e., political dissent) for a particular referent group (i.e., Nazi Party) can be seen in the marked differences in the seventeen year olds' responses. Although 63% feel that dissidents ought to be allowed to hold public protests, less than half are willing to allow the Socialist Party to nominate a Presidential candidate and less than one-third will allow a member of the Nazi Party to campaign on TV.

Similarly, when seventeen year olds were asked specifically if particular groups should or should not be allowed to hold public meetings in order to present their views, none of the eleven organizations received unanimous support from the students. Students are unwilling to give a blanket grant even when the right involved is one of the basic first amendment freedoms; for six of the groups, less than half of the students displayed a tolerant attitude; only four groups received such support from over 80% of the students. The most positive responses went to the AFT, NOW, and SDS; the least favored groups were radical political groups (Nazi Party, Communist Party, KKK). Less that one-fifth of the students professed to have "no opinion" about these groups--with the exception of the Socialist Party and Gay Liberation Front (both 20%) and the John Birch Society (43.9%). Students clearly have opinions and they aren't always very democratic.

The nine year olds apparently have a fairly strong commitment to a basic concept of equity. But curiously, although three-fourths would agree to having a friend of a different skin color, they would not want to sit by such a friend in school!

In short, from this national sample of students, we must conclude that among American youth in 1976, there is modestly strong lip service given to general principles of equity and tolerance of diversity but severely constrained application of these general rules to both specific groups and activities. Young people shy from granting freedom to criticize the government and to applying

equal rights to both sexes; they are also particularly harsh on non-mainstream political and social groups. Civil rights, Vietnam, Watergate and ERA not withstanding, the more things change the more they remain the same. The tumult and chaos of the 1960's and early 1970's may have accomplished a great deal but it did not make equalitarians out of anti-democrats.

To examine the patterns of responses to these tolerance measures, and to summarize the data generated by these items, a principal components analysis was performed and the resulting factor matrix subjected to varimax rotation (Nie, et al., 1975; 468-482). Only measures on which at least 20% of the respondents in an age group varied were included in the analysis of each group. Thus for example only the athiest and the unemployed male's picture-questions were included for age 13 and none were used in the following analysis of seventeen year olds' attitudes.

Few of the NAEP questions are of the very general abstract nature used by Prothro and Grigg to measure acceptance of democratic values. All of the items for the nine and thirteen year olds and all but those loading on the international dimension for seventeen year olds involve a specific referent and relate to specific issues or actions. This shows up clearly in the factor loadings for each cohort. (See Tables 2, 3, and 4)

Ethnic and sexual equity are specific dimensions in the attitude constructs of all three age groups. For those seventeen, when race was the referent but the activity was procedural--political dissent--the procedural norm seemed to override the significant of the referent (speak against Black voting). For nine year olds, the sexual referent dimension overshadowed the procedure and the ordering seemed structured by the clues or symbols of the referent group.

More generally, however, sex and ethnicity seem to dominate as ordering principles for youth responses more so than general notions of equity or procedural norms related to the vote or expression. This and the general acceptance of the right of the black factory worker to vote (mentioned above) suggests that the

Table 2

Results of Principal Components Analysis
of Responses to Measures of Tolerance
Nine Year Olds

	Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix			
	Ethnic Equity	Franchise Equity	Sexual Equity	Vote Equity
Sit by person of different color	.73	.15	.15	.04
Teacher of different color	.75	.07	.1	.02
Friend of different color	.63	.09	.28	.02
Girls and boys on same team	.12	.02	.31	.03
Women get same pay	.11	.08	.44	.05
Factory worker vote	.05	.21	.15	.10
Athiest vote	.08	.48	.26	.15
Unemployed vote	.10	.61	.00	.07
Vote of rich more important	.01	.12	.12	.48
Vote of educated more important	.02	.07	.03	.42
Vote of men more important	.11	.14	.42	.12
Eigenvalue	2.64	1.41	1.06	1.03
% of Variance Explained	24.00	12.80	9.70	9.40
Total Variance Explained	55.80			

Table 3

Results of Principal Components Analysis
of Responses to Measures of Tolerance
Thirteen Year Olds

	Varimax Rotated factor Matrix			
	Ethnic Equity	Political Criticism	Sexual Equity	Political Dissent
R1 Women run for office	.22	.10	.75	.16
R2 Qualified get jobs	.53	.14	.16	.35
R3 Wrong to criticize	.15	.68	.06	.04
R4 Swimming pools for all	.49	.12	.23	.16
R5 Free to criticize	.08	.70	.10	.13
R6 Hotels for all	.63	.17	.13	.11
R7 Dissenters protest	.06	.27	.11	.33
R8 Women same rights	.15	.06	.61	.12
R9 Equity in positions	.57	.11	.19	.11
R10 Women out of politics	.32	.13	.65	.09
R11 Women need vote	.35	.12	.35	.25
R12 Criticism good for gov't.	.06	.58	.07	.17
R13 Complain to gov't.	.19	.20	.08	.38
R14 War the only way	.35	.08	.12	.12
R15 Talking over fighting	.45	.02	.17	.41
R16 Nation has faults	.40	.09	.12	.40
R17 Criticism interrupts	.21	.66	.08	.15
Athiest vote	.47	.17	.22	.48
Unemployed vote	.33	.15	.14	.46
Eigenvalue	5.75	1.89	1.31	1.03
% of Variance Explained	30.30	10.00	6.90	5.40

Total Variance Explained = 52.60

Table 4

Results of Principal Components Analysis of
Responses to Measures of Tolerance
Seventeen Year Olds

	Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix				
	Political Activity	Political Criticism	Sexual Equity	Ethnic Equity	International Equity
GI protest	.57	.11	.08	.00	.13
Size of Family	.68	.16	.08	.02	-.02
R1 Women run for office	.06	.12	.79	.12	.11
R2 Qualified get jobs	.01	.03	.21	.50	.29
R3 Wrong to criticize	.11	.68	.10	-.01	-.02
R4 Swimming pools for all	.05	.11	.21	.63	.03
R5 Free to criticize gov't	.11	.66	.10	.09	-.02
R6 Hotels for all	-.02	.18	.20	.50	.27
R7 Dissenters protest	.12	.45	.08	.12	.04
R8 Women same rights	.03	.07	.50	.21	.06
R9 Equity in positions	.06	.06	.30	.40	.32
R10 Women out of politics	.10	.12	.78	.19	.17
R11 Women need vote	.02	.13	.41	.20	.33
R12 Criticism good for gov't	.06	.46	.04	.02	.06
R13 Complain to gov't.	.02	.35	.01	.15	.19
R14 War the only way	.01	.04	.19	.04	.36
R15 Talking over fighting	.00	.04	.10	.14	.63
R16 Nation has faults	.03	.20	.01	.15	.42
R17 Criticism interrupts	.07	.69	.07	-.02	.23
Nazi campaign	.68	.07	-.00	.08	.02
Groups to meet	.90	.00	.03	.03	.08
Nominate Socialist	.47	.03	.01	.06	.02
Black vote	.67	.19	.02	.13	-.08
Eigenvalue	4.70	3.05	2.02	1.34	1.1
% of Variance Explained	20.4	13.3	8.8	5.8	4.8

Total Variance Explained = 53.1

current drive within society to foster sexual and racial equality may in fact have had some impact on the attitudes of youth; if society put an equal emphasis on other forms of equality, one wonders if dissent and criticism would become as acceptable for "deviant" groups.

The differences between thirteen and seventeen year olds on the number of factors may in part be the result of the sophistication that comes with maturation. While the thirteen year olds seemed unable to differentiate, the seventeen year olds were able to group the abstract items dealing with nationalism (chauvinism?). The specific factors have, however, a technical explanation also. Only the seventeen year olds' schedule involved specific questions related to political activity and this category accounted for 20% of the total variance explained. Thirteen year olds showed an inclination to group political activities in that two of the items that were included in the seventeen year olds' factor of political criticism, were structured by thirteen year olds according to the dissent component of the measures. Attitude patterns of nine year olds seem to differentiate between who should vote (franchise) and the relative importance of the vote (equity). In spite of the differences, for each age group, the factors generally explained a little over half of the variance in the series of items measuring tolerance.

Factor scores for each respondent were computed by using only those items which had a .30 or above loading on a specific factor and did not load highly on any other factor. Thus a discrete, unambiguous summary score was established and the relationship between the various factors could be examined. (Table 5)

The most striking of the patterns of relationships seen in Table 5 is the fact that (1) the correlations between these dimensions which fit under our general rubric of tolerance are rather modest but all are statistically significant, and (2) the internal relationships are weaker for the seventeen year olds than the nine year olds. For all three age groups, the strongest correlations are between the two factors that provide specific group references-ethnic and sexual. The attitudes of nine-year olds concerning who should vote and the equity of votes

Table 5

Correlations Between Factors of Tolerance

Nine Year Olds

	Ethnic Equity	Franchise Equity	Sexual Equity	Vote Equity
Ethnic Equity		.23	.33	.21
Franchise Equity			.25	.46
Sexual Equity				.33
Vote Equity				

Thirteen Year Olds

	Ethnic Equity	Political Criticism	Sexual Equity	Vote Equity
Ethnic Equity		.32	.42	.30
Political Criticism			.24	.34
Sexual Equity				.24
Political Dissent				

Seventeen Year Olds

	Political Activity	Political Criticism	Sexual Equity	Ethnic Equity	Int'l Equity
Political Activity		.17	.09	.13	.12
Political Criticism			.24	.19	.17
Sexual Equity				.41	.28
Ethnic Equity					.33
International Equity					

All coefficients = $p \geq .05$

are clearly related. The data presented in Table 5 do not suggest that a highly integrated or constrained tolerance orientation is present in the political orientations of these youth; yet we are impressed at the degree of cohesion that does seem present. Given the findings about attitude constraint in mass publics in general, these data are rather encouraging. Although the extension of rights is highly qualified by specific referents or situations, tolerance among young people is not a totally issue-specific component of their political orientation.

We note that the overall tolerance umbrella that seems to appear in nine year olds begins to fold by the time students reach seventeen. This may, of course, be a function of the different measures employed; it may indicate that seventeen year olds are highly discriminating in their evaluations of situations and have a higher priority structuring their responses to these measures than one of tolerance; it may be that the norms of tolerance stimulated in early childhood through abstract principles and democratic myths looses its appeal for the late adolescents.

An examination (not reported here) of the relationships of measures within each factor (inter-item correlations) suggested that there is more consistency within the various factors than between them, and that the magnitude of this internal consistency is age related. For example, the attitudes of seventeen year olds on measures related to ethnic equality were more highly correlated than those of thirteen year olds which, in turn showed more internal consistency than did the nine year olds. The internal consistency for all age groups was again strongest within measures of ethnic and sexual equity.

In summary, young people show considerable variation in their responses to measures dealing with respect for the rights of others--openness, equity, mutual cooperation and understanding; these measures cluster in terms of specific actors or actions (i.e. ethnicity, voting); and the internal relationships or consistency of responses for a single dimension or factor (political criticism) is greater than the correlations between the various components that make up the tolerance

dimensions.

Tolerance, Information and Participation. The general approach to political socialization or formal citizen education in this country has traditionally had three focci--developing a tolerant, informed and involved citizenry. The general assumption is that these three develop and change more or less in tandem and in fact, NAEP data indicate that there is a modest relationship between political information and participatory orientations. (Jones, 1979). Research on political behavior among adults shows a consistent relationship between knowledge, participation and pro-democratic attitudes. Our purpose here is to determine if an attitudinal dimension related to tolerance is also a part of the general political orientation of youth.

Summary measures of level of political information and participation as well as an overall tolerance score (based on the factors) were computed for each respondent. (See Appendix I for the measures involved.) The data in Table 6 indicate that the relationship of these three dimensions are statistically significant but vary considerably among the different age groups. Two common features are seen however. First, none of the individual components of the tolerance scores correlate as strongly with the information or participation scores as does the summary measure--indicating in fact a possible cumulative characteristic of attitudes of tolerance. Second, these tolerance attitudes are more highly correlated with those of participation than information; this is especially true for younger students. The anomalous pattern of relationships for thirteen year olds combined with the close similarity of the relationships for nine and seventeen year olds seems to rule out a developmental explanation for these relationships.

Based on these data, one does not know the causal ordering; formal programs that emphasize participatory skills and orientation may stimulate increased tolerance or a development of appreciation for equity and diversity might be the motivation of political involvement.

In search of explanations. Early research on political socialization emphasized

Table 6

Correlations Between Tolerance,
Levels of Information and Participatory Orientations

Political Tolerance	Information	Participation
	AGE NINE	
Ethnic	.01	.17
Franchise	.04	.13
Sexual	.07	.13
Vote	.15	.13
Summary: Tolerance Information & Participation=.26	.23	.22
	AGE THIRTEEN	
Ethnic	.00	.22
Criticism	.04	.15
Sexual	.03	.19
Dissent	.07	.18
Summary: Tolerance Information & Participation=.11	.05	.26
	AGE SEVENTEEN	
Activity	.20	.18
Criticism	.28	.15
Sexual	.17	.15
Ethnic	.10	.12
International	.03	.12
Summary: Tolerance Information & Participation=.22	.28	.24

All coefficients = $p \leq .05$

the positive role of parents and family in political socialization although later studies began to qualify the scope of parental transmission of political orientations (Hyman, 1959; Greenstein, 1965; Jennings and Niemi, 1968; Niemi, 1973; Sears, 1969). Parental influence appears to be relatively strong in terms of party identification. It plays some role in attitudes toward religious and minority groups but has negligible impact on policy issues, political efficacy and trust. Jennings and Niemi's (1968) study of adolescents found very limited agreement between parent and child propensities to respond to issues involving the concrete application of civil liberties. However, when parents are homogeneous in their orientations, the similarity of parent and child attitudes is increased.

The school's role in political socialization is even more difficult to assess. The early assumption about its general importance (Easton and Dennis, 1969; Hess and Torney, 1967) has given way to a view of its role that is more constrained and indirect. In concluding a review of research in the school as an agent of politicization, Ehman (1977; 24) summarized as follows:

--the school is more important for transmitting political information than in shaping attitudes and behaviors

--classroom climate is strongly related to positive political attitudes

--school organization and governance is related to political attitudes

--regular civics curricula have little impact on most students

Recent societal emphasis on equal rights and affirmative action is expected to have impact on the socialization process and thus change the findings of gender and racial differences in political socialization of the 1960's. At that time, sharp differences were found in the way young men and women related to politics (Hess and Torney, 1967; Greenstein, 1961; Hyman, 1959). Girls were more differential toward authority and a rule of law, boys were more interested in and informed about politics. Boys were also more inclined to participate in political-like behaviors but by high school, sex-related participation differences began to diminish. Research dealing with racial differences (Lyons, 1970; Greenberg, 1970; Abramson,

1977) has repeatedly found that black and white students have quite different orientations toward the political system, feelings of efficacy, levels of political information, and motivations to participate. They appear also to be affected differently by the various agents of socialization.

Our approach is to try to identify the extent to which these four traditional "contextual" elements of the political socialization process--home, school, race, gender--help explain differences in student political tolerance orientations in the mid 1970's and to assess the relative position of each aspect for each of the three age groups. We are also interested in comparing the importance of these contextual factors to the other two legs of the citizenship triangle--information and participation. Thus we have employed stepwise multiple regression analysis to determine the relative independent effects of these six dimensions and to estimate their combined ability to explain differences in general tolerance orientations.

A summary of this analysis is presented in Table 7; again, the difference in age groups are striking. The single most important factor explaining variation in tolerance is different for each age group--school environment is most important for the youngest students, participatory orientations for the thirteen year olds, and for the pre-adults, levels of political information are most important. The importance of the school for the development of tolerance in young students is contrary to the general conclusion cited above on the impact of school on political attitudes. However, the school is the dominant social institution beyond the home in the life of the nine-year old and is the first major experience outside the home with learning social rights and responsibilities. It is not surprising that the school environment would be influential in developing tolerance orientations in nine year olds. What is surprising, perhaps, is that the work on "school climate" has been focused primarily on older students--students with much wider socio-political experiences and for whom the school environment is only one (and certainly not always a primary) aspect of

Table 7

Summary
Multiple Regression Analysis of
Factor Contributions to Tolerance

Age Nine	B	R^2
School environment	.26*	11%
Home environment	.17*	3
Level of information	.15*	2
Race of student	.1 *	2
Gender of student	.14*	2
Partipatory orientations	.00	0
Total Variance Explained		20%
Age Thirteen		
Participatory orientations	.26*	7
Gender of student	-16*	2
School environment	.13*	2
Race of student	.12	1
Home environment	.07	1
Level of information	.03	0
Total Variance Explained		13%
Age Seventeen		
Level of information	.23*	8%
Gender of student	-.20*	4
Participatory orientations	.18*	3
Race of student	.08	1
Home environment	.05	0
School environment	.01	0
Total Variance Explained		16%

*p - .05

the socialization process. Our data, in fact, suggest that school environment is the least powerful of the six measures in explaining tolerance for the older students. We are also impressed at the significance of gender for the attitudes of the older students. Not only is the pattern the reverse of the nine-year olds (among the older students, females are more tolerant) but gender contributed more than race or home environment to explaining the variation in tolerance.

When the relationship of the three parts of the citizenship triangle are considered from this vantage point, there is a marked interaction between political tolerance, information, and participation. Participatory orientations make the major contribution to explaining tolerance within the thirteen year old group; political knowledge serves the same function for those who are seventeen. This would suggest that the approach to citizen education that seeks to move on all three fronts simultaneously may be the correct one; the modest correlations reported earlier may simply mean that the entire approach lacks major impact.

Overall, the total amount of variation explained by our "contextual" factors is rather small. Even for the nine year olds, whose horizons and experiences are assumed to be relatively constrained, we can explain only twenty per cent of the variance. For each age group, the first factor entered in the regression dominates the explanation such that any future inquiry along these lines, especially for the older students, will have to consider multicollinearity among these measures.

We also examined these six measures as possible explanations for levels of political information and participatory orientations. Political tolerance was the most important in explaining participatory orientations for nine and thirteen year olds; participation among the older students was best explained by school climate. Explanations for levels of information differed for each age group; school again was most important for nine year olds; participation for thirteen year olds, and tolerance for seventeen year olds. Total variance explained for participation ranged from 8.8% (13 years) to 17% (17 years) and for information

from 3.3 (13 years) to 23% (9 years); and it was always lowest for the thirteen year olds--the age believed by many to be most critical in the general as well as political development of future citizens.

Findings in Perspective. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted a survey of civic education in ten countries (Torney, et al.; 1975) and a large number of the measures included in their concept of "democratic values" were identical to those we have been analyzing for attitudes of tolerance among American students. Although some testing was done of 10 year olds, the American IEA survey only included fourteen year olds and pre-college students. American students assessed in the IEA study were found to be considerably below the mean of all ten countries in their support for democratic values but above the mean in support for the national government and in interest/participation. American students were noticeably lower on measures of sexual political equality than students from any other country in the study. This relatively anti-democratic posture of American youth was most pronounced among the preuniversity students.

Our findings that knowledge, participation and tolerance are so modestly related plus the fact that acceptance of democratic values is specific to particular actors, groups or activities suggests that the IEA-based conclusion that

> the factors of the educational and political system which contribute to a high level of support for the national government fail to inculcate a high level of support for democratic values" (Torney, 1975; 253)

may be applicable to our data as well.

If American youth do not measure up well against their peers in other democratic countries, how do they measure up against American adults? No parent data accompanied the NAEP surveys so we can only make rough approximations of how these youth will compare with a sample of adults. Realizing that the measures and the samples are not comparable and that any comparison of these two groups is at best suggestive, the following may give us some insights:

42% of adults (CPS, 1976) placed themselves on the positive side of a continuum measuring equal roles for men and women
58% of a Gallup Poll (1976) respondents favored the equal rights amendment and
60% of the seventeen year olds felt women should have the same rights as men in every way.

78% of the adults (NORC, 1975) said they would vote for a qualified woman for President and
76% of the seventeen year olds felt women should run for public office and take part in government much the same as men do.

48% of the adults (NORC, 1975) disagreed that men were better suited emotionally for politics than most women while
78% of the young people disagreed with the statement that women should stay out of politics.

69% of the adults (NORC, 1976) said they would vote for a qualified Black for President and
94% of the seventeen year olds felt that no matter what a man's color,religion or nationality,if he is qualified for a job, he should get it.

55% of the adults (NORC, 1976) would allow a communist to make a speech in their community and
63% of the youth felt that people who disagree with the government should be allowed to meet and hold public protests.

Like Jennings and Niemi (1975;1334) we find that young people tend to be somewhat more tolerant or liberal than the adult population; however, we are also impressed with how similar the two are on several dimensions. The question of course, remains, "Will these adolescents' predispositions toward democratic values increase, decrease, or remain stable."

NAEP data indicate that the answer to this question may be quite mixed. In the five years between the social studies assessments, the trend in the performance of young Americans on measures designed to tap the model of democratic citizenship is disappointing at best. The average performance of nine, thirteen and seventeen year old students on social studies questions dealing with substantive socio-economic and political information was lower in 1976 than in 1972, significantly so for seventeen year olds. By 1976, thirteen and seventeen year olds, on the average, gave acceptable responses to just under two-thirds of all the social studies questions; nine year olds averaged slightly more than half. The largest and most consistent decline among the three age

groups was in the area of political knowledge. Measures of social studies skills--"skills needed to broaden one's realm of knowledge--to obtain information and to interpret (it)," (NAEP, 1978; 17) showed significant declines in the average performances of thirteen and seventeen year olds (and no change for nine year olds).

Between 1969 and 1976 average performance on citizenship assessment measures of knowledge of the political process and orientations to participate declined for each age group with the greatest and most consistent decline again among the older students. On measures designed to measure the realization of goals such as "have a curiosity about human affairs and have a reasoned commitment to the values that sustain a free society," all three age groups declined in average performance--significantly so for the two older groups. Although the net change is a negative one, the pattern among the measures of tolerance were quite mixed. The change data could not be incorporated into our analysis of tolerance attitudes (because of the unique sample of NAEP and the distribution of measures on the various protocols) but the pattern of these measures was quite similiar to that of the data used in the preceeding analysis. (Table 8; Appendix II)

The measure concerning acceptance of an athiest' right to express opinions in public shows low absolute acceptance as well as a significant decline in tolerance from the first assessment while positive attitudes about personal racial interaction were widely held and showed an increase in openness. The movement in terms of tolerance was not the same for the thirteen year olds and the seventeen year olds. The younger students became less tolerant of athiest's right to hold office and more tolerant of newspapers criticizing government whereas the older students showed the reverse pattern.

The fact that there was relative little change in attitudes of tolerance does not indicate that the society is making much progress in socializing to democratic values. The increase in racial understanding is heartening but the

Table 8

Selected Attitude Measures, 1976
and Changes 1969-1976.

	% democratic responses	
	Age 13	Age 17
Newspapers, magazines allowed to publish criticism of government official	52.7 (4.8)*	66.7 (-8.7)*
Athiest allowed to express views publicly	59.8 (-4.1)	75.5 (-3.8)
Anti-democratic government book allowed in libraries	NA	81.3 (-7.9)*
Immediate punishment of accused by accusers acceptable	86.2 (0.0)	90.5 (1.3)
Athiest allowed to hold public office	49.3 (-10.1)*	66.2 (2.1)
Minors have right to express political views publicly	75.5 (3.9)*	88.1 (-1.1)
Teens should have same legal rights and protections as adults	NA	84.0 (-5.3)
Willing to have person of another race Be barber or beauty operator	82.3 (2.1)	86.4 (7.4)*
Attend church or synagogue	87.7 (1.3)	92.3 (2.7)
Live in neighborhood	80.6 (4.1)	78.7 (4.1)
Sit beside on train or bus	78.1 (-.4)	87.3 (1.6)
Vote in national elections	85.6 (-1.6)	94.5 (-.4)

* Figures in parenthesis represent change since earlier assessment; asterisk indicates significant change .05 level of confidence

changes are relatively minor considering the priority given racial and sexual equality in the agenda of governmental policies during the first half of the 1970's.

American students are not terribly tolerant but there is reason to believe that some attitudinal structuring does take place within and between various facets of the basic orientation we have labeled tolerance. Maturation seemingly plays a role but exactly what it is remains unclear. The traditional triad of democratic values-knowledge, participation and tolerance--are modestly related; each is more useful in explaining variation in the other than the usual "agents" of school, home, race, or gender.

Appendix I
Information Measures

Age Nine

1. In the United States, is a movie theater usually owned and run by some level of government?
2. In the United States, is a police station usually owned and run by some level of government?
3. In the United States, is a farm usually owned and run by some level of government?
4. We have a government for the nation in Washington, D.C. We also have state governments and local governments.
   Do all three of these governments make laws?
   Do all three of these governments try to prevent crime?
   Do all three of these governments have a large army, navy and air force?
5. Local governments pay policemen and firemen with the money people pay in taxes?
6. Local governments collect taxes to pay for the cost of running the local television station?
7. Can laws be changed?

Age Thirteen

Questions one through six above were also asked of thirteen year olds.

Age Seventeen

1. According to the U. S. Constitution, senators are elected to a term of how many years?
2. The U. S. Constitution provides a method for filling a vacancy in the office of Vice President. What is that method?
3. After a long trial, a person is acquitted of burglary. The district attorney believes that this person should be retried because of the overwhelming evidence of guilt. Which one of the following is a constitutional obstacle to retrial?
4. The results of the Presidential election from one state are as follows:
   Candidate A received 45 percent of the popular votes.
   Candidate B received 40 percent of the popular votes.
   Candidate C received 15 percent of the popular votes.
   What percent of this state's electoral votes would traditionally go to candidate A?
5. There are three branches of the federal government: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Each branch has different responsibilities. Fill in the oval beside the branch of government which has the major responsibility for each of the following functions: Writing and passing laws; Directing the carrying out of laws; Judging if laws are constitutional; Vetoing bills; Approving presidential appointments to office.
6. Suppose a United States senator proposed a bill to ban trade with another country. Which of the following persons is in the best position to get that bill actually voted on by the U. S. Senate?

All measures had fixed choice responses; correct answers were summed to provide a summary information score.

Participation Measures

Age Nine

1. Instead of the teacher deciding, I like the class to vote on what games we play at recess.
2. Sometimes I am willing to be a leader in a game.
3. When I play with my friends I like to help decide what we are going to play.
4. When my friends argue I always stick up for the friend I like best.
5. When my class votes to do a project I'm not interested in, I help the class complete the project.
6. I am interested in learning about government.
7. I like to watch TV programs about elections and politics.
8. I like to guess who is going to win in elections.

Age Thirteen

1. Some people think it is important to discuss what is going on in government and politics much of the time. Other people prefer not to talk about such things. . . . indicate how often you talk with others about what is going on in our country in government and politics.
   With your friends? With your parents? With your teachers in class?

2. Some people feel that it is important to know what is happening in other countries. Other people are more interested in their own country. I . . indicate how often you talk with others about what other countries are doing.
   With your friends? With your parents? With your teachers in class?

3. Suppose your school had a rule which you felt was unfair. What could you do to try to get it changed? (open ended)

Age Seventeen

1. Suppose our government officials in Washington passed a law which you believed to be unjust. Would you try to do something to get the law changed?

   Questions one through three asked of thirteen year olds were also asked of the seventeen year olds.

Unless otherwise indicated, all measures had fixed choice responses; those responses suggesting participatory or involvement orientations were summed to provide a summary participation score.

Measures of School Context

Age Nine

1. I have some say about what we do in class.
2. How often do you talk about government or politics in your class?

Age Thirteen

1. How often do you have discussions on national, state or local government or politics in your classes?
2. How often do you have discussions about international politics and global problems in your classes?
3. How many courses have you taken in the past three years that dealt with government, public affairs, or politics?
4. In each statement below, please fill in the oval that BEST describes the general conditions in your school.
   Students are encouraged to make up their own minds.
   Teachers try to get students to speak freely and openly in class.
   Students can feel free to disagree openly with their teachers.
   Our teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to express them.
   In some schools the students help decide about school affairs; in others, the teachers and administrators make almost all of the decisions. How is it in your school--do the students help decide about school affairs?

Age Seventeen

1. In school, have you studied how to acquire information about political issues?
2. In school, have you studied how to analyze the values and alternatives involved in political issues?
3. Civics, history or government courses pay enough attention to important political issues such as race relations, political demonstration, poverty, and issues of war and peace.
4. Civics, history or government courses give students an accurate picture of the way American politics works.
5. Civics, history or government courses don't provide students with new ideas about politics. The students already know much of what is taught.
6. Civics, history or government courses give students the knowledge they need to participate in politics.

All of the questions asked of thirteen year olds were also asked of seventeen year olds.

Appendix II

Measures used to report change in attitudes 1969-1976

1. People feel differently toward people of other races. How willing would you be to have a person of a different race doing these things?

   Be your barber or beauty operator
   Come to your church or synagogue
   Live in your neighborhood
   Sit beside you on a train or bus
   Vote in national elections

2. Should a newspaper or magazine be allowed to publish something that criticizes an elected government official?

3. Should a person who believes there is no God be allowed to express his views publicly?

4. Some authors have written books arguing that democracy is a bad form of government. Do you think libraries in our country should be allowed to have these books for everyone to read?

5. During the time when the western United States was being settled, a person accused of a crime was sometimes punished immediately by those who accused him. Do you think this was the right way to deal with him?

6. Should a person who does not believe in God be allowed to hold a public office?

7. Should citizens who are younger than the legal voting age have the right to write letters to elected government officials or to publicly express their views on political issues?

8. Adults who are arrested or detained have certain legal rights, such as having a lawyer to represent them. Do you think teen-agers who are arrested or detained should have the same rights as adults?

9. Measures used to report attitudes about the right to vote.
   Used pictures and were the same for all three age groups.

Footnotes

1. The National Assessment of Educational Progress seeks to provide descriptive information about the knowledge, understanding, and attitudes of young Americans ages nine, thirteen, and seventeen and to measure changes in educational attainment over time. NAEP is under contract with the Education Commission of the States through funds provided by Congress to the National Institute of Education. The author is indebted to the staff of NAEP, especially Roy Forbes, Wayne Martin, Ina Mullis and the data processing staff for their cooperation in accessing these data.

References

1. Abramson, Paul R., The Political Socialization of Black Americans, New York: Free Press 1977.

2. Campbell, Angus, Converse, Philip E., Miller, Warren E., Stokes, Donald E., The American Voter, New York: Wiley 1964.

3. Easton, David and Dennis, Jack, Children in the Political System: The Origins of Political Legitimacy, New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.

4. Ehman, Lee H., "The Function of the School in the Political Socialization Process: American Findings", Paper prepared for the International Conference on Political Socialization and Political Education, Tutzing, West Germany, October 1977.

5. Greenberg, Edward S., "Black Children and the Political System," Public Opinion Quarterly, 34 (Fall 1970) pp. 333-345.

6. Greenstein, Fred I., Children in Politics, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

7. Greenstein, Fred I., "Sex-Related Political Differences in Childhood," Journal of Politics, 23(1961) pp. 353-371.

8. Hess, Robert D., "Political Socialization in the Schools," Harvard Educational Review, 38 (1968) pp. 528-536.

9. Hess, Robert D. and Torney, Judith, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Chicago: Aldine Press, 1967.

10. Hyman, Herbert, Political Socialization, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959.

11. Jaros, Dean, H. Hirsch, and F. J. Fleron, "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American sub-culture," American Political Science Review, 62 (June, 1968) pp. 522-560.

12. Jennings, M. Kent, The Student-Parent Socialization Study, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, ICPSR, 1971.

13. Jennings, M. Kent and Niemi, Richard G., "Continuity and Change in Political Orientations: A Longitudinal Study of Two Generations," American Political Science Review, 69 (December, 1975) pp. 1316-1335.

14. Jennings, M. Kent and Niemi, Richard G., The Political Character of Adolescence: The Influence of Families and Schools, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

15. Jennings, M. Kent and Niemi, Richard G., "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child," American Political Science Review, 62 (1968) pp. 169-84.

16. Jones, Ruth S., "Changes in the Political Orientations of American Youth, 1969-1975," Youth and Society, 10 (June, 1979) pp. 335-359.

17. Jones, Ruth S., "News Media and Politicization: American Youth 1969-1975," Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology meeting, Washington, D.C., May 24, 1979.

18. Langton, Kenneth and Jennings, M. Kent, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States," American Political Science Review, 62 (September, 1968) pp. 852-867.

19. Lawrence, David G., "Procedural Norms and Tolerance: A Reassessment," American Political Science Review, 70 (March, 1976) pp. 80-100.

20. Lyons, Schley R., "The Political Socialization of Ghetto Children: Efficacy and Cynicisms," Journal of Politics, 32 (1970) pp. 288-304.

21. McClosky, Herbert, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," American Political Science Review, 58 (June, 1964) pp. 27-45.

22. Merelman, Richard M., Political Socialization and Educational Climates, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

23. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1969-76, Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1978.

24. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Changes in Social Studies Performance, 1972-76, Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1978.

25. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Citizenship Objectives, Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1969.

26. Nie, Norman H., Hull, C. Hadlai, Jenkins, Jean G., Steinbrenner, Karin, Bent, Dale H., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill 1975.

27. Niemi, Richard G., "Political Socialization," In Jeanne Knutson (ed.) Handbook of Political Psychology, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

28. Prothro, James W., Grigg, Charles M., "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement," Journal of Politics, 22 (May, 1960) pp. 275-294.

29. Pomper, Gerald M., Voters' Choice, New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975.

30. Remmers, H. H., Franklin, Richard D., Anti-Democratic Attitudes in the American Schools, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

31. Sears, David O., "Political Behavior" in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, 2nd edition, Vol. 5, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

32. Stouffer, Samuel A., Communism Conformity and Civil Liberties: A Cross-Section of the Nation Speaks Its Mind, Gloucester, Mass.: Smith, 1963.

33. Torney, Judith V., A. N. Oppenheim and Russell F. Farner, Civic Education in Ten Countries, New York: Holsted Press, John Wiley, 1975.

34. Zellman, Gail L., Sears, David O., "Childhood Origins of Tolerance for Dissent," Journal of Social Issues, 27 (1971) pp. 109-139.